one watermark on the document that corresponds to the determined protection level using the selected printer, as recited in claim 1.

Stefik further fails to disclose a document forgery protection printing system, comprising at least one server having a print management system and a policy that determines a forgery protection requirements and a forgery protection level for the document; at least one image processor that processes an image of the document; a plurality of printers, each printer able to print the document and able to apply at least one protection level to the document by printing at least one watermark on the document that corresponds to the determined protection level, as recited in claim 10.

In Stefik, the trusted rendering device combines four elements, namely, a usage rights language, encrypted on-line distribution, automatic billing for copies, and digital watermarks for marking copies that are rendered (col. 4, lines 61-64). It is the contact providers that indicate the terms, conditions, and fees for printing documents in a machine-readable property rights language, i.e., usage rights language (col. 4, lines 65-67). The usage rights language is used for controlling and printing the digital work and is determined by the owner of the digital work, who enters the conditions in which the digital work can be used and distributed through the usage rights language.

However, the usage rights language is not a computerized policy, which determines forgery protection requirements for the document, but instead, is machine-readable language based on grammar (Appendix A). For example, a COPY right denotes that a copy of the digital work may be made (col. 5, lines 52-53). The owner writes the digital work and assigns the usage rights including a print right, which specifies watermark information (Fig. 5; step 501). It is the owner of the digital work that determines and enters the forgery protection requirement for the document as part of the usage rights language. Accordingly, the trusted rendering device simply manages the printing of the document in accordance with the

parameters entered by the owner of the digital work. There is no computerized policy stored on the computer device that determines the forgery protection requirements for the document to be printed.

Stefik further fails to disclose a document forgery protection printing method that includes, in part, determining a protection level to be applied to the document based on the determined forgery protection requirements, as recited in claim 1, and a policy that determines a forgery protection requirement and a forgery protection level for the document, as recited in claim 10. As discussed above, the owner of the digital work determines the forgery protection requirements of the digital work and the protection level that should be applied to that digital work (Fig. 5). Each one of the digital works has a print right assigned to it by a person, i.e., the owner. The print right specifies the watermark information that will be printed on the document (Fig. 6). However, the print right is determined by the owner. Thus, the print right is not a computerized policy that determines the forgery protection requirements for the document to be printed and determines a protection level to be applied to the document based on the determined forgery protection requirements.

As clearly shown in Figs. 16 and 17 of Stefik, the repository contacts the trusted printer server, step 1701. The distributor repository encrypts the document, step 1702. The distributor repository sends the encrypted document to the server, step 1704. The server stores the encrypted document, step 1705. At some point, the spooler gets ready to print the document, but before starting, it runs a process to create a new version of the glyph font that includes the watermark data, step 1706 (col. 17, line 14 - col. 18, line 5). The spooler begins imaging the document with the watermark that is already assigned to that document by the user who inputs that information to that particular document using grammar for the usage rights language. The print server and spooler are simply printing out the document with the assigned watermark given to it by the owner. There is no computerized policy. The print

server is only performing a printing operation by printing the document with the assigned watermark.

Furthermore, the spooler 1603 is coupled to the printer 1604 (col. 16; lines 56-57). There is no selection of a printer from a plurality of printers that can print the document, as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Thus, Stefik does not disclose or suggest a document forgery protection printing system that includes at least one server having a print management system and a policy that determines a forgery protection requirement and a forgery protection level for the document, as recited in claim 10 or a document forgery protection printing method that includes determining forgery protection requirements for the document to be printed utilizing a print management system and a computerized policy stored on a computer device and determining a protection level to be applied to the document based on the determined forgery protection requirements, as recited in claim 1.

Because Stefik does not anticipate or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 10, Stefik cannot anticipate or suggest the subject matter of claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1 and the subject matter of claims 11-17, which depend from claim 10, at least for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 10 and for the additional features recited therein. Thus, the pending claims are patentable over Stefik.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/tea

Date: August 8, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461